

FI
Cont

an abutment portion contiguous with the plug portion and projecting upwardly from the upper face of the plug portion in the direction of the axis, the abutment portion having a cavity at its upper face for receiving one end of said diode, wherein a radius of the plug portion is smaller than a radius of the abutment portion.

REMARKS

A. Status of Pending Claims and Explanation of the Amendments

Claims 8 – 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as allegedly being indefinite.

The Examiner states that it is not clear whether the applicant is attempting to claim an assembly of parts or an alternator.

Respectfully, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that claims 8-10 are directed to “an alternator” having “an assembly according to claim 5”. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejection of claims 8-10 is requested.

Claims 1-7 and 11-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 4,472,649 by Namba et al. (“Namba”), U.S. Pat. No. 4,321,664 by Matthai (“Matthai”), and U.S. Pat. No. 3,812,390 by Richards (“Richards”). Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Namba, Matthai, and Richards, in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,286,186 by Hagenlocher (“Hagenlocher”). Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Namba, Matthai, Richards, and Hagenlocher in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,828,564 by Mori.

Claim 11 has been amended to further clarify the invention. Support for this claim can be found throughout the specification and in particular on page 5 and in Fig. 1. No new matter has been added by entering these amendments. The amended claims can be found in the Appendix in interlineated format in accordance with the current PTO procedures.

B. Claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 11-19 Are Patentably Distinct from the Cited References.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 11-19. Independent claims 1, 5, 8, 11, and 17 were alleged to be unpatentable over Richards, Matthai, and Namba. However, none of these references teach, disclose, or suggest “a diode having a casing that is welded on the plinth” as recited in the applicant’s original and amended claims. Because all of the claimed elements are not shown in the cited references, the rejection must be withdrawn. (MPEP §2143.01)

1. Namba, Matthai, and Richards Fail to Teach, Disclose, Or Suggest “a Diode Having a Casing that is Welded on the Plinth”

The November 7, 2001 Office Action admits that Namba does not teach “the diode having a housing welded to the plinth” and that Matthai “does not [teach] the diode housing being fixed by welding.” (November 7, 2001 Office Action, page 3).

Furthermore, the Office Actions alleges that Richards teaches “a housing fixed to the plinth by welding to allow easy replacement” (See November 7, 2001 Office Action at paragraph 5). Respectfully, this is not correct.

Richards is directed to the construction of an alternator rectifier. The device has “three separate layers” including “[an] output terminal layer 39, [an] insulating, supporting, and heat sinking layer 41, and [an] input terminal layer” (Col. 2, lines 18-22). Additionally, “all three layers [are made of] metal” (Col. 3, lines 10-11), and “diodes are affixed to the metal plate by means of a soft solder or spot weld” (Col. 2, lines 67-68).

Importantly, Richards does not disclose diodes with casings. Furthermore, Richards does not disclose the use of plinths and certainly does not teach, disclose, or suggest “a diode having a

casing that is welded on the plinth” as recited in Applicant’s original independent claims 1, 5, 8, and 17 and amended claim 11.

For at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 5, 8, and 17 and amended claim 11 are respectfully asserted to be patentably distinct from the cited references and in condition for allowance.

Dependent claims 3, 9, and 10 are patentably distinct from the cited references for at least similar reasons. The Office Action does not allege that the secondary Hagenlocher and Mori references alleviate the shortcomings for the references discussed above. Accordingly, these claims are also in condition for allowance.


CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. In the event that a telephone conference would facilitate examination of this application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: April 24, 2002

By:



Matthew K. Blackburn
Registration No. 47,428

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154-0053
(212) 758-4800 Telephone
(212) 751-6849 Facsimile

Appendix

11. (Twice amended) A plinth for supporting a diode, said diode having a casing welded to the plinth, said plinth comprising:

a plug portion having an upper face and defining an axis at a right angle to the upper face;
and

an abutment portion contiguous with the plug portion and projecting upwardly from the upper face of the plug portion in the direction of the axis, the abutment portion having a cavity at its upper face for receiving one end of said [the] diode, wherein a radius of the plug portion is smaller than a radius of the abutment portion.